UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,951	01/17/2002	John R. Hind	RSW920010122US1	1746

7590 12/27/2007	**EXAMINER**
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts IBM Corporation T81/503 PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	BETIT, JACOB F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/051,951	HIND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Bétit	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 October 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _3-23,25-27,30-50,52-54,56,57,59-78,80-84 and 88-93_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _3-23,25-27,30-50,52-54,56,57,59-78,80-84 and 88-93_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application

after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the

appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to

37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 01 October 2007 has been entered.

Remarks

2.   In response to communications filed on 01 October 2007 claims 3-4, 7, 10, 20, 22, 26, 27,

30-31, 34, 37, 47, 49, 53-54, 56-57, 59, 62, 65, 75, 77, 81-84, and 88-93 are amended and claims

94-99 are added per applicant's request. Claims 3-23, 25-27, 30-50, 52-54, 56-57, 59-78, 80-84,

and 88-93 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
> in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83,

and 88-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent

No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1)

As to claim 94, Dedrick teaches a method of managing meta data using a central

repository at a central repository subsystem, the central repository being accessible by a

computing device through a communications network, the method comprising the steps of:

connecting to the central repository through the communications network based on a user

input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

updating a local repository of the computing device with at least one segment fi'om the

central repository that is associated with the user to produce a meta data collection associated

with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

utilizing, by the computing device, the meta data collection during a current user session

at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column 7, line 40

through column 8, line 22),

wherein the utilizing step comprises retrieving, from the meta data collection, meta data

that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device (see

column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

Dedrick does not distinctly disclose meta data that would be most appropriate for each of

different contexts of using the computing device based on at least a current role of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this, see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Arlein et al. because these teachings

would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of

the user's differing roles.

As to claim 96, Dedrick teaches a computer program product embodied on computer

readable medium readable by at least one of a computing device and a central repository

subsystem, for managing meta data using a central repository at the central repository subsystem,

the central repository being accessible by the computing device through a communication

network, the computer program product comprising:

computer executable code configured to connect, through the communications network,

to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21);

computer executable code configured to update a local repository of the computing

device with at least one segment from the central repository that is associated with the user to

produce a meta data collection associated with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29); and

computer executable code configured to utilize, by the computing device, the meta data

collection during a current user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the

computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22),

wherein the computer executable code configured to utilize comprises computer executable code configured to retrieve, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

Dedrick does not teach meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on at least a current role of the user.

Arlein et al. teaches this, see paragraph 0009 and see paragraph 0032. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Arlein et al. because these teachings would customize the content of the user based on the user's activities while preserving privacy of the user's differing roles.

As to claim 98, Dedrick teaches a system for managing meta data in a secure manner, the system comprising:

a central repository subsystem comprising a central repository for storing a plurality of segments associated with a user in a collection order (see column 9, lines 57-65); and

at least one computing device capable of communicating with the central repository subsystem through a communications network, the computing device comprising a local repository and being capable of connecting, through the communications network, to the central repository based on a user input (see column 20, lines 4-21), updating the local repository with at

least one of the segments from the central repository to produce a meta data collection associated

with the user (see column 20, lines 22-29), and utilizing the meta data collection during a current

user session at the computing device to assist the user in using the computing device (see column

7, line 40 through column 8, line 22),

wherein the computing device retrieves, from the meta data collection, meta data that

would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on

at least a current role of the user (see column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 22).

As to claims 3, 30, and 57, Dedrick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:

incrementally uploading any new meta data generated during the current user session

from the computing device to the central repository (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claims 4, 31, and 59, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the connecting step

comprises:

receiving, by the central repository subsystem, authentication information from the user

(see Dedrick, column 20, lines 10-15);

verifying validity of the authentication information (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 14-

17); and

notifying the computing device that the user has proper authority to access the central

repository if the authentication information is verified as valid (see column 20, lines 20-24).

As to claims 10, 37, and 65, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the retrieving step is performed using heuristics algorithms (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 12); and the utilizing step further comprises applying the retrieved meta data in each of the different contexts (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claims 11, 38, and 66, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the current context comprises at least one of the following:

opening a web page, filling in a computer form, filling in a password-changing form, providing a certificate, opening a computer file, processing a computer file, or executing an application program (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, line 40 through column 8, line 23).

As to claims 17, 44, and 72, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the current context is for filling in a computer form, and the applying step comprises:

automatically filling in the computer form with said most appropriate meta data (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 8, lines 13-22).

As to claims 20, 47, and 75, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing step comprises:

formulating search requirements based on a current context of using the computing device; and executing a search based on the search requirements using heuristics algorithms (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 21, 48, and 76, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the search

requirements specify weighted properties of the current context of using the computing device

(see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, line 9 through column 8, line 31).

As to claims 22, 49, and 77, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches further comprising the step of:

providing a graphical user interface (GUI) (or a meta data editor) for allowing the user to

organize the meta data collection (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, lines 53-64 and see column 8, lines 23-

31).

As to claim 56, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the computer device uploads any

new segment to the central repository at a predetermined time (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 20, lines 26-

29).

As to claim 83, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the central

repository and the local repository is implemented using a network-attached storage (see

<u>Dedrick</u>, column 3, lines 7-49).

As to claims 91- 93, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the meta data collection stored

in the local repository of the computing device at the user's side (see <u>Dedrick</u>, figure 2, reference

number 27). Although <u>Dedrick</u> does not distinctly disclose that the meta data collection includes

a plurality of meta data groups, each of the meta data groups corresponding to one of a plurality

of roles of the user Dedrick as modified above according to the teachings of Arlein et al. teaches

this see Arlein et al. paragraphs 0009 and 0032.

As to claim 95, Dedick as modified, teaches further comprising the step of: updating any

new segment from the computing device to the central repository at a predetermined time (see

Dedrick column 20, lines 26-29).

As to claim 97, the applicant is directed to the citations in the rejection of claim 95 above.

5.   Claims 5-6, 25, 32-33, 52, 60-61, 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No.

2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57,

59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of Nguyen (U.S. patent No.

5,638,448).

As to claims 5, 32, and 60, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the

authentication information comprises user identification, a pass phrase of the user, and an

identifier for the central repository or a component at the central repository subsystem.

Nguyen teaches this, see column 16, lines 13-33. Therefore it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified

Dedrick as modified, to include the teachings of Nguyen because these teachings would prevent

the password from being transferred over the network and allow both the client and the server to

authenticate each other (see Nguyen, column 16, lines 13-16).

As to claims 6, 33, and 61, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified teaches wherein the verifying stop comprises: determining a secret key represented as a hash of: the received user identification, concatenated with a hash of the received identifier, concatenated with the received pass phrase; and comparing the secret key with a stored key associated with the user (see <u>Nguyen</u>, column 16, lines 13-33).

As to claims 25, 52, and 80, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein, in the encrypting step, the encryption key is represented as a hash of identifying information associated with the new segment, concatenated with a pass phrase of the user.

<u>Nguyen</u> teaches this, see column 16, lines 13-49. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Dedrick</u> to include the teachings of <u>Nguyen</u> because these teachings would prevent unauthorized access to the data using an encryption key that is difficult to predict.

6.   Claims 7-9, 34-36, and 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Dedrick</u> (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of <u>Arlein et al.</u> (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of <u>Kim</u> (U.S. patent No. 6,546,002 B1).

As to claims 7, 34, and 62, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the updating step comprises:

(a) determining if the local repository is at a null state;

(b) first requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit any segment associated

with the user that has not been applied to the computing device if the determining step indicates

that the local repository, is not at a null state; and

(c) second requesting the central repository subsystem to transmit all segments associated

with the user if the determining step indicates that the local repository is at a null state.

Kim teaches (a), see column 7, lines 38-65; (b), see column 7, lines 52-65; and (c) see

column 7, lines 44-51. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dedrick to include the teachings of Kim

because these teachings would synchronize data with the server if the profile was already on the

client and copy the profile to the client if it was not already there (see Kim, column 7, lines 38-

65).

As to claims 8, 35, and 63 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further

comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said

first requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29); and

applying the decrypted at least one segment to the meta data collection to produce the

meta data collection associated with the user (see Kim, column 7, lines 52-65).

As to claims 9, 36, and 64 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the updating step further

comprises:

receiving at least one segment from the central repository subsystem in response to said

second requesting step (see Kim, column 7, lines 44-51);

decrypting the at least one segment (see Dedrick, column 20, lines 21-29); and

generating the meta data collection for the user using the decrypted at least one segment

(see Dedrick, column 20, lines 23-25).

7.   Claims 12-16, 39-43, and 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No.

2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57,

59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of Bull et al. (U.S patent No.

5,901,287).

As to claims 12 and 39 Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the utilizing stop further

comprises: continuously collecting meta data resulting from use of the computing device during

the current user session at the computing device (see Dedrick, column 7, lines 40-52).

Dedrick as modified does not distinctly disclose the method further comprises:

(a) generating a new segment based on the collected meta data upon completion of the

current user session; and

(b) processing the new segment.

Bull et al. teaches (a) and (b), see column 4, lines 38-32. Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Bull et al. because these teachings

would allow updated information to be available the next time they use the system (see Bull et

al., column 4, lines 28-33)

As to claims 13 and 40, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the processing step

comprises:

updating the meta data collection with the new segment (see Bull et al., column 4, lines

28-33).

As to claims 14 and 41, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the meta data comprises

application data for being usable in an application executable on the computing device, and

context data for identifying context in which said application data are used (see Dedrick, column

7, line 40 through column 8, line 12), and wherein the utilizing step further comprises:

determining statistical information associated with the meta data, the statistical

information indicating relationships between the meta data, wherein the retrieving step is

performed in part based on the statistical information (see Dedrick, column 7, line 65 through

column 8, line 12).

As to claims 15 and 42, Dedrick as modified, teaches wherein the context data identify at

least one of the following: user roles, uniform resource identifiers (URIs), file names, and/or

form names pertaining to the application data (see Dedrick, column 5, lines 1-16).

As to claims 16 and 43, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the application data comprise at least one of the following: page display setting data, file display setting data, user ID/password combinations, field values for computer forms, user's preference data, bookmarks, and certificates (see <u>Dedrick</u>, column 7, lines 40-52).

As to claim 67, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claim 68, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 13 above.

As to claim 69, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 14 above.

As to claim 70, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 15 above.

As to claim 71, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 16 above.

8.   Claims 18, 45, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Dedrick</u> (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of <u>Arlein et al.</u> (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of <u>Mohan et al.</u> U.S. patent No. 6,505,230 B1).

As to claims 18 and 45, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein, if the current context is for filling in a computer form, the utilizing step further comprises:

(a) retrieving, from the pieta data collection, alternative meta data that are related to the current context of filling in the computer form; and

(b) presenting the alternative meta data to the user for the user's consideration.

<u>Mohan et al.</u> teaches (a) and (b), see column 11, lines 7-13. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified to include the teachings of <u>Mohan et al.</u> because these teachings

would allow the user to choose to leave some items blank or to fill in items that are not in the

normal user profile without having to delete or fill in items every time a particular form is filled

out. (see Mohan et al., column 11, lines 2-6)

9.   Claims 19, 46, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1)

as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77,

83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of Chun et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0184527 A1).

As to claims 19, 46, and 74, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the

current context is for filling in a password-changing computer form, and the retrieved meta data

comprises a user identification and a password, and wherein the applying step comprises:

presenting to the user the password in an obfuscated format; determining whether it is safe to

present the actual password to the user; and presenting the actual password in a non-obfuscated

format when it is determined to be safe to present the actual password.

Chun et al. teaches this (see paragraph 0050). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick

as modified to include the teachings of Chun et al. because these teachings would give the user

the ability to change passwords and retrieve forgotten passwords (see Chun et al., paragraph

0050).

10.   Claims 23, 50, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1)

as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77,

83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,636,246 B1).

As to claims 23, 50, and 78, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the

GUI displays a graphical tool in a cylindrical configuration for organizing the meta data

collection.

Nagahara et al. teaches this, see column 5, lines 18-33. Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified, Dedrick as modified to include the teachings of Nagahara et al. because these

teachings would provide superior operability when making selections from a menu (see

Nagahara et al., abstract).

11.   Claims 26, 53, 81, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1)

as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77,

83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings

the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" (herein referred to as

Net Security article).

As to claims 26 and 53, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the

computing device implements a Common Data Security Architecture (CDSA), and the utilizing

step is performed -by a CDSA add-on module.

Net Security article teaches this, see page 1, paragraphs 1 and 2. Therefore it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified to include the teachings of Net Security article because these

teachings would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented into

multiple applications (see Net Security article, page 1, paragraph 1).

As to claim 81, the applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 26 above.

As to claim 99, <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, teaches wherein the computing device further

comprises:

a plurality of applications selectably executable on the computing device (see column 5,

lines 52-67);

a data repository module, provided as an add-in module to the security-service providing

architecture, for utilizing the meta data collection to assist the user in using the computing device

(see figure 8, step 306); and

an encryption/decryption module for encryption any new segment to be transmitted to the

central repository subsystem (see column 6, line 35 through column 7, line 8).

<u>Dedrick</u> does not distinctly disclose a security-service providing architecture structure for

selectively providing security-based services to at least one of the plurality of applications.

"Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-

Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" teaches this, see page 1, paragraphs 3-5. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have modified <u>Dedrick</u> to include the teachings of"Net Security Standard from the Open

Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further" because

these teachings would standardize the security protocol so it can more easily be implemented

into multiple applications (see "Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the

Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further", page 1, paragraph 1).

12. Claims 27, 54, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dedrick (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1)

as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77,

83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. patent publication No.

2002/0077842 A1).

As to claims 27 and 54, Dedrick as modified, does not distinctly disclose wherein the

central repository subsystem is implemented using WebDAV protocols.

Charisius et al. teaches this, see paragraph 0010. Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified, Dedrick

as modified to include the teachings of Charisius et al. because these teachings would allow

multiple users to view the same workflow and project plans, provide persistent storage, monitor

the progress of activated project plan, and simultaneously create plans from the same workflow

(see Charisius et al., paragraph 0010).

13. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick (U.S.

patent No. 5,710,884) in view of Arlein et al. (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to

claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98

above, and further in view of Lim (U.S. patent No. 6,728,843 B1).

As to claim 84, <u>Dedrick</u> does not distinctly disclose wherein the data repository module resides on a proxy machine accessible through a predetermined connection means.

<u>Lim</u> teaches this, see column 8, lines 46-58. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Dedrick</u> as modified, to include the teachings of <u>Lim</u> because these teachings would grant access to the remote servers through a common API (see <u>Lim</u>, column 7, lines 34-44).

14.   Claim 88-90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Dedrick</u> (U.S. patent No. 5,710,884) in view of <u>Arlein et al.</u> (U.S. patent No. 2002/0133500 A1) as applied to claims 3-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 30-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 56-57, 59, 65-66, 72, 75-77, 83, and 88-98 above, and further in view of <u>Mosher, Jr. et al.</u> (U.S. patent application publication No. 2003/0050930 A1).

As to claim 88, <u>Dedrick</u> does not distinctly disclose wherein the uploading step comprises: (a) temporarily locking the local repository; (b) transmitting the encrypted new segment from the computing device to the central repository subsystem for storage in the central repository; and (c) unlocking the local repository.

<u>Mosher, Jr. et al.</u> teaches (a), see paragraph 0010; (b), see paragraph 0014; and (c), see paragraph 0017-0019. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Dedrick</u> to include the teachings of <u>Mosher, Jr. et al.</u> because these teachings would prevent further updates until notification that current records are safely stored to the backup system.

As to claims 89 and 90, the applicant is directed to the citations in the rejection for claim

88 above.

Response to Arguments

15.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not deemed

persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that Arlein cannot be used to "assist the user in

using the computer device" because the location of the persona profile is remote from the user

and only accessed by the merchant site and not the user, the arguments have been considered, but

are not deemed persuasive. It is first noted that the Arlein reference is being used to assist the

user as the user browses merchant sites using a computer device. The content supplied to the

user in the Arlein is based on a customization that is made for the particular user to assist the

user in performing the user's current role. It is also noted that the profiles in Dedrick and Arlein

are both used to customize content that is being browsed; the difference being in the location of

the profiles. While Arlein may have reasons for keeping the profile remote from the user as

pointed out by the applicant in the paragraph starting on the bottom of page 33 of the

amendment, the teaching of having customized profiles for each of different roles of a user is

compatible with the teachings of Dedrick. This is because the user may desire different content

when visiting a site based on the current role of the user, even if the user is not worried about the

merchant may identify this is the same user now performing a different role.

Conclusion

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

jfb
17 Dec 2007

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER